UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?

Watchman, watchman, what of the night?
Lift high your lantern; show the light!
Is everything peace and quiet abroad;
The city guarded and free of fraud?
Do the stars shine down on a plenty to spare,
And is there laughter and love to share?
O, watchman, what of the night?

It's the zero hour, and this of the night:
Broken the lantern; gutted the light!
The city is guarded but not from fraud.
War and murder are rife abroad.
The cost of the killing mounts with a leap,
But human life is counted cheap.
The flares of riot are red on the sky,
And racial hatred takes long to die.
And there's never a star but a slithering fog
Where want and misery ride at a jog.
The children wail in the streets for bread,
And civilization is in the red.
The beggar still haunts the rich man's board,
But the crumbs are few from the rich man's hoard.
The worker stumbles his road alone—
And where's the finger to move a stone?
The multitudes mouth their numbing cry
Where king and bishop alike pass by;
And the churches bow to an empty form
While Christ the outcast trudges the storm.
And that is what of the night.

Leslie B. Wynne

VOLUME CXX NUMBER 8

Chicago, December 20, 1937

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 119
Jottings—J. H. H. 121

ARTICLES—
Christmas and the Christ—L. G. MACNAUGHTAN 122
A Portia Come to Judgment—JOHN ARCHER 124
Can the Christian Use the Boycott?—HERBERT HIGGINBOTHAM. 127
New Evangelism—MIRIAM ZIONY 128
World Government With or Without Geneva—LOLA MAVERICK LLOYD 129

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
When Will Christmas Come?—RALPH CHEYNEY 126
Christmas, 1937—RALPH CHEYNEY 126
Love at the World's Door—LUCIA TRENT 126
Christmas Night—MARY WARD 126

POETRY—
Tinsel Wrappings—EVA WILLES WANGSGARD 128

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Meaning of Death—JAMES LUTHER ADAMS 130
Henry Ford—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 132
A Handbook of War—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 132

THE FIELD—
All-American Holidays—SYDNEY STRONG 118
Vote Supports Stricter Neutrality—Pax International 118

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

All-American Holidays

Many churches and clubs expect to celebrate "Forefathers' Day" on the 20th or 21st of December—this being the time of the landing of the Pilgrims from the *Mayflower*. Of course, it is especially appropriate for the "descendants"—lineal, ecclesiastical, or political—to "keep" the day, to revive memories or the principles of democracy in church and state.

I am led to call attention to the fact that the calendar contains a succession of All-American Holidays that might appropriately, and with great profit, be "kept" during the coming year. These may be named as follows:

January 1—Emancipation Day.

February 12—Lincoln's Birthday.

February 22—Washington's Birthday.

May 30—Memorial Day.

July 4—Independence Day.

September (1st Monday) — Labor Day.

October 12—Columbus Day.

November 11—Armistice Day.

November (last Thursday)—Thanksgiving.

December 20 or 21—"Forefathers' Day."

In our time when the principles of democracy are in danger of being lost, it would be well if our churches, schools, and clubs would turn during the coming year to the observance of these All-American Holidays, especially since the first Pilgrims did not "keep" Christmas or Easter—days that have been grossly commercialized in our times. And the days mentioned above are All-American (not importations) and each conveys some important principle of democracy—from January 1, when was declared the freedom of the Negro, to December 20 when the "Pilgrim ideas" of freedom came to our shores.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Seattle, Washington

Vote Supports Stricter Neutrality

In September of this year a popular vote was taken on this question. The Institute of Public Opinion, which conducted this poll, is the most accurate measure of public opinion in America. That poll, asking whether Congress should call for even "stricter neutrality or discretion for the President," showed the following results: 69% for stricter neutrality; 31% for discretion. —*Pax International.*

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXX MONDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1937 No. 8

PEACE AND JUSTICE

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. It will be worthy of a free, enlightened and great nation, to give to mankind the example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence.

—George Washington.

CHRISTMAS, 1937

The immortal Christmas song of the angels, as correctly translated in modern versions of the Scriptures, reads "Peace on earth to men of good will." This is immensely more significant than the traditional version, since it describes the boon of peace not as a gift from God but as an achievement by men. We may have peace in the world if we have good will in our hearts! This does not mean that there are not all kinds of economic and political and social questions mixed up with the war problem. Nobody can hope to understand this problem today who is not familiar with the forces making for conflict in the very structure of our international system. But these forces are driven by hatreds and lusts and fears, as these in turn are themselves created by the forces in question, and they can be controlled and in time altogether absorbed only by good will within men's hearts. There is an inextricable intermingling, in other words, of both material and spiritual factors in the making of war and peace; and we are inclined to believe that it is the spiritual factors, like the spirit in the wheels in Ezekiel's vision, which may be central. In any case, whatever the economic changes and social rearrangements which may be achieved in the world today, there can be no enduring peace until men have established this peace within their hearts. It is men of good will who will at last bring in the Kingdom. This surely is the Christmas message—and what a mandate this message lays upon the churches! Are these witnesses themselves the practitioners as well as preachers of good will? Are they purging the hearts of their members of all pride and prejudice? Is a Christian, a church-member, conspicuous apart from other men for his all-embracing love of humankind? At Christmastide it seems as though good will were at last taking possession of our lives. But the days pass, and the old worldly ways return! To make Christmas a perpetual festival of good will, this is our task—and primarily that of the churches which celebrate Christ as Lord and master of us all.

NEUTRALITY IN THE FAR EAST

Unity is all for neutrality. We believe, as a first step, that the Neutrality Act, now dormant upon our statute books, should be put into effect. The President asserts that war has not been declared in China, and that therefore there is no war—a point of view which would undoubtedly surprise the population of Shanghai! In addition, the Neutrality Act by due process of legislation, should be greatly strengthened and extended, that this country may have no remotest part in the Sino-Japanese struggle. The reasons for neutrality are two. First, it is the one and only way of keeping America out of the war. If we did not learn this truth during the World War, then we are incapable of learning anything. We kept out of that war just as long as, and just to the exact measure that, we continued neutral. As a matter of fact we began taking sides in one way or another rather early, and thus early began slipping into the fight. Neutrality was our anchor in the gale, and it did not hold. Now in Asia, as yesterday in Europe, we face the same challenge, and nothing can save us but keeping our men, money, and munitions out of China. The second reason for neutrality has to do not with ourselves but with mankind. This is the way to peace in a struggle which threatens momentarily to engulf the world. To abandon neutrality is to spread the flames. To adhere to neutrality and then practice it is to release those forces of constructive intelligence and good will which can alone bring an end to war. Neutrality is not isolation in a cowardly attempt at self-security. Neutrality is friendship in a brave attempt at coöperation for the common good. Brotherhood is our goal. Well, then, let us begin our brotherhood with China and Japan together, that, as friends of both unhappy peoples, we may use our utmost influence to end their fighting. Now, as in 1915-16, we have the opportunity to lead and organize the neutral opinion of the world to peace. God grant that Mr. Roosevelt may not lose his chance as Mr. Wilson did, and therewith wreck humanity!

HIGH PRICES

We can't for the life of us see why the administration in Washington is so excited all of a sudden by the high cost of living. Here is the Federal Trade Commission on the job of finding out what is the matter. Yet we distinctly remember that again and again the President has said that it is his purpose to "raise the price level," which is a euphemistic way of saying, "make it more expensive for all of us to live." And now that the New Deal has done just this thing, the White House professes great concern. It is true, we have no doubt, that Mr. Roosevelt is correct in saying that "monopolistic practices and other unwholesome methods of competition" are involved in this public tragedy of living costs 14 per cent higher than they were when the President took office. Big business can be trusted to do its share to boost prices and incidentally profits. But to lay exclusive emphasis upon these factors is to drag a red herring across the trail. We agree absolutely with the New York *Times,* a paper friendly to the administration, that

> ". . . it would be a totally unrealistic picture of the course of events during the last four years which failed to take account of the extent to which the policies of the Administration itself have been responsible for rising prices. The Administration devalued the dollar, specifically for the purpose of raising prices. It restricted farm production, with the same end in view. It has worked consistently to increase wages and to shorten hours, two factors which necessarily enter into the making of prices. And it has been forced by its own large expenditures to increase taxes. It would be astonishing, in these circumstances, if the cost of living had not mounted."

Increasing wages and shortening hours are wholly laudable, but these items must be linked up with a program of abundant production. And there's the rub! The whole basis of the New Deal is found not in an abundance but in a scarcity economy, and scarcity can mean nothing but high costs and low standards of living. It is just here that we find the reason for our failure to follow Mr. Roosevelt, which has greatly surprised so many of our friends. We do not believe that any program of reform is sound, however well-intentioned or ably conceived, that curtails the production of goods in factory and on farm. On the contrary, we believe that there is no solution of our present ills which is not based on abundance—the largest production, most widely distributed, at the lowest prices. The details of this program are *our* New Deal! High prices right in the midst of a new depression is the penalty of unwisdom.

THINGS THAT ARE EQUAL TO THE SAME THING . . . !

Evidences of the business recession are now indubitable. All indices are down, unemployment is rapidly rising, the President is talking about some more "priming of the pump." At the same time we read of the desperate endeavors being made by labor to get together. The A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. were flying at one another's throats not so long ago, and now they are snuggling up together like two shorn lambs in a fold. Do these two facts have anything to do with one another? They certainly do! With returning prosperity, labor was riding high. The field of conquest looked so easy, that labor fell to fighting over the prospective spoils, and Green and Lewis became two chiefs fighting not so much against their common enemy as against one another. But now is coming the chill dark winter. We've got another depression on our hands. Jobs are getting scarce again; money for union dues will soon be running low; union membership will straightway fall off—and then trouble! For the way of the union organizer, like that of the transgressor, is hard—at least, in hard times. Meanwhile, we may be pardoned, at this trying moment, if we ponder the sheer madness of labor conditions in this country. Employers still fighting labor, as though coöperation with labor on the basis of collective bargaining were not the open road to efficiency and happiness. Employes, workers, fighting one another, as though a united front in recognition of common interests were not indispensable to improved conditions. Both sides practising violence, betrayal, espionage as though these methods were not absolutely fatal to any cause which they are intended to serve. And capital, labor, and the public generally complacently believing that there is any permanent solution of pressing problems under a system where low wages destroy purchasing power, and high wages raise prices and again destroy purchasing power. We are caught in a vicious circle—wages fighting prices, depression cycles eating up the good of prosperity cycles, private profit exploiting public interest, and war devouring the fruits of peace. Are we never going to understand that there is nothing gained in patchwork, higgledy-piggledy reform, and that only a thorough-going, drastic, fundamental reconstruction of the social order, a new system for a new world, can get us anywhere?

SALUTING THE FLAG!

It is a relief at last to find a judge in this country who sees the issue of religious freedom involved in the refusal of members of the religious cult, known as Jehovah's Witnesses, to allow their children to salute the flag in school. Case after case has been coming up in various parts of the country, and judge after judge has ruled that the Witnesses' children must raise their hands in ceremonious salute of the nation's symbol. The position of the Witnesses is perfectly clear. They believe that homage is due to God alone, and that formal salutation to a flag or any other earthly object is an act of worship which is sacrilegious. So they refuse to let their children thus betray their own faith, and, like martyrs of old, have been suffering fines and imprisonments. Now comes a Federal Court judge, Albert B. Maris, of Philadelphia, to upset all this petty persecu-

tion by appeal to the Constitution. Public officials, says Judge Maris, have no right to enforce an action upon devout religious people who believe that action a spiritual offense. If the Witnesses declare they are moved by religious motives, they are wholly within their rights, and the government cannot dispute them, for to allow public officials to determine whether people are sincere on religious grounds or not would "sound the death knell of religious liberty." If the refusal to salute the flag imperilled the public health or safety, the state might have some reason to act, but it does not. Hence the issue of religious liberty is clear. "Liberty of conscience," says Judge Maris, "means liberty for each individual to decide for himself what is to him religious." If we would see how true is this decision, let us imagine that the "Heil Hitler" salute were required of German children in German schools, and some German Christians refused to allow their children thus to act, and were punished for their "crime." We would call this tyranny, would we not? As a matter of fact, exactly this salute has been required in German schools, as the flag salute is required in our schools, and Jehovah's Witnesses there as here have refused obedience on religious grounds. And Hitler is punishing them, exactly as we are. It is time this Nazi business was stopped in this country. Judge Maris is leading the way!

A GREAT INDIAN SCIENTIST

The death last month of India's foremost scientist, Sir Jagadis Chunder Bose, reminds us anew of the amazing genius of the people of India who, according to standard English doctrine, are incapable of self-government. Dr. Bose was one of the supreme scientific thinkers and researchers of the contemporary world. His studies of plant life, as poetically beautiful as they were scientifically accurate and profound, caught the attention of mankind, and made his name as famous in the West as in the East. In any list of the ten or twelve most distinguished scientists of the last generation, Jagadis Bose's name would not only be included but ranked high. Nor was Bose the only Indian who enjoyed this unique kind of eminence among the world's great men. To him must be added Mahatma Gandhi, whom we still believe to be what we hailed him many years ago—"the greatest man in the world." Then, as a third in a trinity of famous men, stands Rabindranath Tagore, poet, educator, sage, and seer. Many would expand this group of three to include a fourth—Jawaharlal Nehru, surely one of the outstanding political leaders of modern times, a statesman as well as an heroic advocate of the people's rights. Where today can be found a nation to match India in four such men as these? Must not such towering peaks leap from an Himalayan range of intellectual and spiritual attainment which covers the length and breadth of this continental land? And note the variety in these men—Gandhi a saint, Tagore a poet, Bose a scientist, Nehru a statesman! But their qualities are shared as well as distributed, for Gandhi is a statesman as well as a saint, Nehru a martyr and saint as well as a statesman, Tagore an educator and philosopher as well as a poet, and Bose used much of his scientific lore to reaffirm and glorify religion. The Indian genius is as varied as it is intense, and as lofty as it is pure. That the race which can produce such men, and has always produced them in its history, should lie in bondage to a military and commercial empire is an irony supremely characteristic of a world founded on materialistic ideas and violent methods.

A CHRISTMAS APPEAL!

This is our last opportunity to appeal to members of our Unity family to make Christmas a festal day for us by sending in some gift subscriptions for the new year, 1938. Subscribe for a friend, or for your minister or rabbi, or for the public library in your town, or for a college reading room, or for old subscribers who have been sorrowfully obliged to give up their subscriptions because of financial misfortunes! Send us your three dollars, in the Christmas spirit, tell us just how you want us to use it, and we will do the rest. Only a few days remain before Christmas day. Write that check now and send it in!

Jottings

Trotsky is the Satan in Stalin's heaven. When Milton wrote his "Paradise Lost," it was Satan who became the hero of the poem. It looks as though this were happening all over again in Russia.

The elephant is the most intelligent and at the same time the gentlest and quietest of all so-called wild animals. He is not a beast of prey, but lives in herds with his fellows on a coöperative basis. He is not a fighting animal—and, if he *does* fight, is declared a "rogue"—i.e., insane. We repeat—the elephant is the most *intelligent* of all animals!

"The influence of Mr. Roosevelt and of American opinion has perhaps played some part in restraint of violence in recent months."—Foreign-correspondent, in the New York *Times*.

Will some little boy or girl please stand up and tell the class where in Europe, Asia, or the islands of the seas, violence has been "in restraint in recent months"?

Mussolini thinks he is a second Caesar. He looks to us much more like Napoleon riding high to his ultimate Waterloo.

Charles A. Dana, the famous editor of the *Sun,* used to say that if a dog bit a man, it was not news; but that if a man bit a dog, *that* was news! Yet, here in a headline despatch in the New York *Times,* it is announced that a French cabinet minister is accused of lying! In the spirit of Dana we should say that, if a cabinet minister did not lie, *that* was news.

UNITY is widely quoted. And no part of the paper so frequently as "Jottings"! So, as we wish a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year to our friends, we resolve with a grateful spirit to "carry on"!

J. H. H.

Christmas and the Christ

L. G. MAC NAUGHTAN

Another Christmas, and another year written into the annals of the history of the human race; a year of suffering, anxiety and privation for a great many people in the Dominion and throughout the world. Despite the assurance at last Christmas by many of our leaders, the world is the same topsy-turvy place as last year, and instead of the promised betterment man's affairs seem to be hurrying to a crisis, if not to a major catastrophe.

There seems to be a leaven at work, arising out of the incompatibility of old and new ways of commercial and social life. On the one hand great new possibilities for the human family can be seen as a vista; possible because of the discovery and creation and accumulation of technical and moral knowledge. All man needs is the reason and courage to apply this knowledge. On the other hand, we see an effort to blame freedom for our present confusion, and to base a remedy on that fact. The policy is to remove freedom and drive man back to times like the middle ages, cast aside mechanical aid except for war and its destructive principle, and make heresy a major crime.

Here is the common everyday man—ourselves—standing on the brink of an abyss or on a threshold, just as he may choose, holding in his grasp his own fate and that of many generations to come, and yet he turns aside from it wearily, perhaps without understanding, the same self-centered creature he was last year, ready to celebrate Christmas because he is eager for a respite from the tyranny and drabness of the monotonous routine of everyday life, ready to forget in the Christmas festivals his little personal difficulties and all the petty little annoyances he has been subjected to during the year. He wants the justification to escape, if only for a short time, from his own serious self, the stark realities, the harsh selfishness of earning a living in these troublesome times.

And yet there is the other side of this man, the more lovable side of his character. He is eager for Christmas and all it means to him. Christmas gives him the opportunity of expressing, in some form or other, that love and fellowship, charity and benevolence which had been instilled in him in his youth through the Christian principle, values which he cannot very well afford to express in his commercial struggle during the rest of the year. This struggle which is life to the mass of the people no matter how mean or sordid it might be is a debasement of that which their early training had led them to expect. Is it any wonder people find so much relief in the Christmas atmosphere? By the emotional relaxation of the people can be judged the repression that has been necessary for them to conform to the false life of today. By the Christmas spirit may be judged the worth of the people. But why should these noble emotions have to wait for the short Christmas period for expression? Why should they have to be imprisoned at all?

This year the consecration of Christmas will be one of the greatest tragical farces in history. In a world full of strife and bitterness, we shall do homage to the "Prince of Peace," the man who was crucified for chasing the money lenders from the temple, for being a disturber of the peace. Who will do homage? Are not the money lenders and keepers of the "peace" with us today? Shall we not all pray that our own private affairs return to normal? And while we pray and prostrate ourselves, will not the streets be filled by our hungry brothers? Normal times indeed . . . to them a meaningless phrase! How then can we pray for a return to "normal times?" How can we continue this sham mockery, this pretense that we as a people are doing the will of God? Surely unemployment and war and want are not a part of a Divine Plan; how could such a state of affairs lead to perfection? The world forgets the command of the Master, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

It is little wonder that in times like these the true Christians turn sick at heart. To them, in a world gone mad, the long struggle has seemed at last futile. We can see them collecting in small groups, as they did in the Master's time, and whispering to each other. "The Master is crucified, the Christ is dead." But this crucified Christ is not He whom we celebrate; we consecrate a symbolic creation of our own. The Master is still the lonely outcast whom none but the very few could or can understand.

The world would seem to be no nearer the truth today than in His time. Who would be so bold as to advocate "returning measure for measure." But no! the clarion call goes forth assembling statesmen to study ways and means of putting things to rights, while evading this fundamental law. It matters naught to them that a Christ has been born, lived and died so that men could be free to love and

live more abundantly. They tell us such aspirations are not constitutional, they are revolutionary. And that is true, they are a revolt against falseness. It is as true today as the day it was uttered that "this people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me."

And all this is so, indeed it can only be so, because we have no faith. Our orthodox religions have no faith. They have lost their meaning and are but awkward beliefs reaching blindly towards the sky, worshiping celestial things, while ignoring man. Religion must walk with man and not try to walk with God, showing man, as an individual, his relation to life. Good we say is the essence of God. But good is always changing, never quite the same in any generation; like the growing warmth of the morning sun it becomes stronger with time.

Religion must come to earth again as Jesus brought it, and guide man towards truth. It must teach the spirit of future things for this world; turn its face towards the real, the living, the vigorous and not towards the dark, the hidden, the mysterious void. What does it matter if men die and remain dead in the grave, the race lives on, using lives as stepping stones. That is the true glory of religion, each individual giving his life to the race so that it may grow towards perfection, and not a selfish seeking to secure eternal bliss. This is what Jesus taught and lived for; it is the real spirit of renunciation found in true religion; it is the very essence of truth found in reality.

We forget that it was flesh and blood that lived. We forget the life. All that is left to us now is an unfamiliar thing—a shadow. What does it avail us to pray if we cannot say that one prayer has been answered. Prayer is often used as a prop for a faltering nerve. We are like the frightened child who runs and buries his head in his mother's bosom, that which frightened is shut out, and soothing hands and voice quiet tumultuous nerves. But that which frightened must finally be faced, and, if possible, overcome by being familiarized. We must go back to the living man for salvation. His Kingdom of God was something to be sought after; it was not a sedative for living but an adventure for the imaginative adventuresome, a scheme for perfecting the race through the individual man.

To save our souls according to popular fashion is enough for the most of us. We have built churches, we worship in them, and who wants to do more than that? Business must be free, we are told. The Kingdom of God that is in our midst is forgotten. Actually we do not forget it but smother it. By all the tricks of human ingenuity we still those values of life that would lead us from confusion. We have no desire to be led forth to strange adventures, we want to be saved without alteration. If we are to ultimately appear before the Unknown that force will have to take us as we are—saved without grace or reason. A few hymns, a few prayers, and a few church services, and that is enough!

Jesus said, "Except you turn and become as little children, it is impossible for you to enter the Kingdom of Heaven." Do we wish to unbend and be as children? Are we prepared to learn life anew? Can we change forces that hinder? We, the old and sophisticated, are hardly aware of our own deficiencies; we have, it would seem, learned all there is to learn. We have no wish to be *born* again. But do we understand? The teachings of Jesus have come to unbend us, to give us the honest and singleness of purpose of childhood, the inquiring simplicity, so that we may learn, ignoring all abstruse reasoning, marching towards the objective without fear.

Jesus, the carpenter's son, who revolted against the law and order of his day, when he spoke with conviction and authority, surprised the people of his own country. "Is not this the carpenter's son?" they asked. Why should they have wondered? It is too real not to be true; they asked because they knew no other than the man. It is the lonely Galilean who would be a savior to humanity and not the unbending God, a mystical being.

What a wrench it must have been to his followers when he was dragged away from them; tried before the rulers, rejected by the people, and nailed to the cross. All truth and goodness had gone from the world, their world, in that moment. The Master was dead. The Kingdom was rejected. There was to be no betterment in human affairs in their time, so they decided the Kingdom was impossible and gave themselves over to despair. But later on, unconsciously it might have been, they saw a glimmer of the truth of Jesus' teachings, so they sent down the ages, for each generation to know, their Jesus, their savior and king. A riddle. A refuge for the weak. But to the strong, enough truth is left uncovered. And this uncovered truth has been growing up in strange and hidden places, even coming into conflict with the established form, but still growing and becoming truer.

This Christmas will be celebrated by a world in turmoil, the agony of a birth. Something new in the world has turned men's hands against each other. And yet this thing is old. Jesus said nearly two thousand years ago, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I come not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes *shall be* they of his own household." Too late did they crucify Him; the seed was sown by the spoken word; the life had been fulfilled, and is still being fulfilled. The cross only accentuated it and made it more real. Flesh and blood died on the cross, but the spirit lives on in his message.

Much of the strife in the world shows that the spirit is growing. Even the defeats in battle prove that the spirit has gained so much that it requires force to suppress. The Christ is living and becomes more real each day. The old god that we worshipped as Jesus is dying out. We had symbolized too much, we still do for that matter. The world today is in violence because men refuse to know Christ; because people refuse to be persuaded that the Christmas feeling can be carried successfully into our commercial life, revolutionizing it; that the spirit of Christmas can be lived with free expression for the full year without danger of lost advantage—changing life into a glorious adventure away from the sly, frightened thing of today, letting the leaven of Christianity work freely.

A Portia Come to Judgment

A Story of the Revolutionary Jesus

JOHN ARCHER

Mrs. Mary Grice sat with a letter upon her lap, thinking furiously. "Well I never," she exclaimed, "whoever would have thought an obscure person like me would be invited to Moordale House to sit down to dinner with royalty and all the elite of high society? Dare I go, I wonder? Of course I must go, for this is the great opportunity of my life. But why has the Duke of Moordale invited me, I wonder? So far as I can recall he and I have never met anywhere and yet in his letter of invitation he reveals a knowledge of my life in Russia and India which, to say the least, is remarkable in one whom so far as I know I have never met or conversed with. Oh, I should like to go, I've always wanted to see life in very select and exclusive circles, and, though I say it myself, I can deport myself in such an assembly as perfectly as any lady, Countess, Duchess, aye or Princess I may meet in such a gathering. Blow me (I beg pardon) I'll accept the invitation and in Lord Milner's famous phrase I'll 'damn the consequences'."

So Mary Grice accepted the Duke of Moordale's invitation to attend a classic and historic dinner at Moordale House—one of the stateliest of the stately homes of England. Arrived there she was met by the Duke and his Duchess, neither of whom, however, enlightened her upon the reason why she had been invited to join so august and distinguished a gathering, for Princes of Royal Blood and the Chief Ministers of the Crown were among the guests—guests who, with the exception of Mary Grice herself, were all "titled" members of London's most exclusive and select society.

Soon did Mary Grice find herself seated at the festive board of this historic mansion, with a Countess on the one side of her and an Earl on the other. Very sedately and with seeming unconcern did she "take stock" of that famous banqueting hall. Her critical eyes noted its artistic arrangements, its luxurious furnishings and furniture, and without seeming ever to have seen them she drank in every detail of the equipment of the liveried flunkeys, who moved in and about with the silent machine-like efficiency of robots. She was naturally critical of the deportment and habits of the guests, and in particular did she make a mental note of the subject matters of the general conversation. She noted with much satisfaction that no one present of either sex had anything to teach her in dining-room etiquette. Indeed she vowed that in respect of graceful sipping from a wineglass, or in lifting asparagus with her fingers and daintily catching it with her mouth, she could give them all a start and a beating.

These things, however, were but little trivialities which had but momentary occupation of her mentality, for she felt there was some vital yet mysterious reason behind the invitation to her to form one of such a distinguished gathering, and all the time her main purpose was to ascertain why she was there at all—there must be a reason, one of serious import and purpose. The mental insipidity of the Countess on her right and the supercilious vacuity of the Earl on her left did little to help her to arrive at any conclusion of the why and wherefore of the invitation to be present. At length the dinner was over, and after the toast—"The King"—had been drunk, His Grace, the Host, rapped for silence and then said:

"My friends, I have tonight indulged in a somewhat rare and venturesome experiment! All of us, with one exception in this assembly, live, move and have our being in a world, in the workaday activities of which we take no part. We live a privileged sort of existence, our lives are sheltered, our comforts are protected, and our days are so surfeited with 'eat, drink and be merry' activities, that our sternest task in living is to find a new momentary excitement and a new thrill, however transient, pulsating in our veins. To some of us, ever and anon, there comes a momentary conscience-pricking which leads such to ask 'Does life ask no more of us than this? Is not there some nobler purpose for us to strive after than to be carried on the backs of others through life?' For when we have the moral courage to face the fundamental realities of life we are compelled to acknowledge that we do not stand upon our own feet and bear our own burdens.

"I have therefore invited a lady who is not of our world to be with us on this occasion, from whom—because of her experience in other walks of life—we might be able to 'see ourselves as others see us.' I have not asked this lady to perform such a service and she with the rest of you is now wondering who the individual will turn out to be. When I name her I pray she will not only accede to my request, but I also trust she will forgive my springing this surprise upon her, my reason for which is that I want her testimony to be spontaneous instead of prepared, lest such preparation might make the truth of the matter obscure. Mrs. Mary Grice is the lady to whom I refer. She has had experience first hand of Britain's Industrial Beehive, and as the wife of a mill-manager she has had similar contact, though not in so familiar a degree, with the industrial conditions in India and Russia. She is therefore armed in unique manner with knowledge and understanding of the conditions of the workaday world in our own land, in our Indian Empire, and in foreign lands outside the Empire.

"Mrs. Grice, would you be good enough to offer us your thought as you have reflected upon the problem of those who toil as compared with those who neither toil nor spin? Your mind may thus, through your spoken word, serve as a mirror in which we may not only see ourselves as others see us, but also learn in some degree, perhaps, of the world beyond the narrow limits of our own class-interest, and thus be led to see what is our duty to our day and its need, and in what measure we fulfill or fail to fulfill such duties."

To say that Mrs. Grice was dumfounded as the Duke made his appeal to her, is but a mild description of her surprise. Almost unconsciously she rose to her feet and without knowing it said:

"Your Highnesses, your Grace, my Lords and Ladies, this is indeed a surprise. I was mystified in being invited, for I am not of your world. I wanted to come, for vanity's sake, yet I dreaded to come because I feared my coming was a response to a call to a duty I might dread to attempt, from a sense of unworthiness and of incapacity to successfully discharge. And, now I am here without a means of reputable escape—

what then shall I say to you?" And, in her nervousness, she began to finger the damask linen tablecloth. As she fingered the cloth her mind began to work and her spirit became peaceful and calm.

"Much," she continued, "was said during the dinner about education and not a little was said about the arrogant ignorance of the working-classes and the need for keeping the lower orders in their place. Will you forgive me if I suggest to you that your education has been all wrong, and, before attempting to pluck the mote out of your brother's eye, you should first remove the beam from your own eye. For you have been made unfit by education to respond to the Divine Will, whose call to you as to every one else is to stand upon your own feet instead of being carried by others, and to bear your own burdens, by breaking the bread you eat in the sweat of your own brows and not through the sweating of other men's brows.

"Look at this tablecloth for instance. It is of exquisite workmanship. Upon its production a whole army of workers have been engaged. It involves not merely the spinning of thread, the designing of the pattern, and the weaving of the fabric, but bleaching, finishing, and pressing. Back of these workers, every one with educated minds and trained fingers for the specific technique of their various crafts, stands the farmer growing the flax; back of the farmer stand the engineer and the mechanic for the production of machinery, and behind these stand the smelter at the foundry, and the miner in the bowels of the earth digging, at the risk of life, the iron ore. All these, and many more types of workers, have played a vital part in the production of a single tablecloth. Has your education furnished any of you with any conception of the labor involved, or equipped you with knowledge and understanding to play a contributory part in any single one of these avenues of toil? You are silent! Very well take this beautiful crockery. Have you ever paused to ponder the labor involved and the education necessary to efficiently engage in the production of these things of everyday use whenever you partake of a meal? Has your education served to give you knowledge and understanding of the digging of clay and its sorting into various qualities, for there are many different qualities in every bed of clay. What do you know of the technique of its burning and baking, its designing of figures in colors upon the surface, and the enamelling of its finishing processes? What has your education done to assist you to play any contributory part in providing yourselves with any of these things so vital for participation in the meal we have just partaken of? So I might in turn ask you to ponder over the production of this matchless silverware, those glorious curtains and draperies, the tables, the chairs, the carpets, the pictures, which equip this banqueting hall with its comforts and utilities, not to mention the clothes you individually are wearing, and all the many articles of utility and adornment so necessary to your personal conveniences and vanities. Is there a single thing in this room or any other room, is there a single foodstuff or a single liquid refreshment you have just partaken of in that wonderful meal we have just consumed, or of any meal you have ever consumed, which you could participate in the production of through knowledge and understanding furnished you by your education? You are silent!

"Your education has not enabled you to produce anything you use, anything you eat, anything you wear. Yet you have abundance of all these things whilst those who do produce them lack a sufficiency of the things they produce! Why is this? For they, like you, are born into a world which no man or body of men could make; and their coming, like your own, is the fruit of the same law of creation. Behind that law there must be an Author of Law, for law is not a matter of chance or accident. We call that Lawgiver by the name of God, since he is not only the author of Law but the Creator of all life. And he decreed that every person born into the world—save the physically infirm and the mentally incapable—should win by labor and in the sweat of their own brows and not in the sweat of anybody else's brow, the bread they should eat. Did the Author of that law confer upon you a privileged exemption from compliance with that law? He made the earth, and his law decreed that every child born upon the earth was, during its sojourn thereon, equally, with every other child born thereon, co-heir thereto and therein.

"He did not bestow the earth upon you as your private perquisite and thereby compel all others to buy from you the right to live and the opportunity to labor. How then did this providence of God—for land embraces in its entirety the whole of God's material providence to mankind—come into your possession? How otherwise than through the functioning of governments controlled by you and your predecessors in their and your interests. And your monopoly power of control over this natural bounty has given further parasitical powers to usury! Money tokens were brought into existence to expedite the exchange of one form of wealth produced from material derived from nature's bounty for some other form of wealth also produced by human labor from material similarly derived from nature's bounty.

"You and those whom you represent in the present and in the past have so perverted the laws of the State that, through the power of monopoly and usury in the use of money it has been made legally possible to take from the toiler, in the shape of rent and interest, all wealth produced save that margin necessary to keep the toiler alive to continue his toiling. You have not merely made the social violation of the command 'Thou shalt not steal' a legal fact, but you have clothed it in the garments of respectability and gentility. For God's command 'Thou shalt not steal,' if it means anything at all, must mean that even you must give every time and all the time 100 per cent of the fruits of your own labor in exchange for the fruits of other men's labor which you appropriate and make your own property—yet you have not a tittle of anything in your possession which is the fruit of your own toil whereby to conform to God's command.

"During the dinner many of you declaimed against the arrogant ignorance of the working-class and of the vital need for keeping the lower orders in their place! Arrogance indeed!! You with all your education are too ignorant to produce anything you eat, anything you use, anything you wear. Your education has taught you nothing save how to live without compliance to the laws of your Creator, and to cover your dishonor you revile the hand which feeds you, and you add insult to injury by making honest toil the symbol of shameful degradation, for with you the term 'A working man' is a term of degrading inferiority. Yet you profess discipleship with the Author of the Golden Rule and proclaim your 'Master' to be the lowly carpenter of Nazareth. As I listened to your anathemas of the so-called 'lower orders' and of the need for keeping

such in their place I imagined I saw Jesus of Nazareth in our midst and I saw the flash of his eyes as he listened to the terms and epithets you applied to the toiling masses who are legally robbed of the fruits of their toil by you monopolists and usurists in this and other countries; and I saw him rise up in wrath against the whole assembly of us, and, with withering, biting irony, again declaim that terrible scourging he administered to the Scribes and Pharisees of his own day recorded in Matthew 23. And never shall I forget the look in his eyes as he answered the Countess on my right and the Earl on my left who both asked, disdainfully, What *he* could do? 'Madam-Sir,' he answered, 'Make tables and chairs so that others may sit and dine as you have just been doing, and also that I may sit and dine with them upon the fruits of other people's labors, through exchange of my carpentry products for their foodstuffs.' Then Jesus continued 'Did I not make it clear to all who would give ear to my voice and hearken to my words that "every tree which my Father had not planted shall be rooted out of the ground," and this tree of your planting is the very negation of every law, decree, edict, and ordinance which God—your Father and mine—has given. You call yourselves "ladies and gentlemen" by which you infer that you are of a finer mould than the average man and woman. You are indeed in the Apostolic succession of those Scribes and Pharisees who were the monopolists and usurists of my own day and whom I drove out of the temple of God with a whip of scorpions. Metaphorically I have to administer a like treatment to you, for your very presence in such a temple would be a defilement of holy ground. I made my meaning clear to all clear-minded and honest seekers of truth that the only way to be God's gentlemen and ladies was to put more into the "common till" of life than they took out, and the only way for any to prove themselves greater than others was to minister and not be ministered to, by rendering a fuller service for every service rendered, even to performing the menial tasks for brethren more weak and frail than themselves. But you! you are in many ways more helpless to bear your own burdens than when you were born. For a babe grows in strength and stature through its unconscious activities and strivings, whereas you, because of your parasitical living, grow more feeble every day to respond to the Divine Call to quit yourselves like men and true mothers of men.' "

Mary Grice paused, and then said: "Thus did I seem to hear Jesus address you. Need I say more?" she asked, in a voice irresistibly vibrating with emotion, as she looked into the spellbound faces of her audience and sat down to a silence which could be felt until the Duke of Moordale rose and said:

"At the moment controversy or debate upon what we have just heard would be sacrilege. I therefore suggest we retire to our own hearths and homes to ponder upon the message which has fallen upon our ears. May I, as one who brought you all together and begged Mrs. Grice to speak just make this one remark? For some time I have been wondering whether or no for us 'the writing was on the wall' and, whether in what we are witnessing today we are seeing the death of an epoch and the birth of a new era. If so, then indeed in Mrs. Grice we have had tonight a Portia come to judgment."

Trumpets on New Horizons

When Will Christmas Come?

How think the Christmas star a fact,
How hear the Christmas bells with awe,
Till its light illumines every pact,
Their echoes peal in every law!

—Ralph Cheyney.

Christmas, 1937

These tinsel stars *are* stars, oh have no doubt!
It is no dollar sign that tops our spires.
You cannot warm your hands at paper fires.
But warm your heart at every Christmas shout
Or else not God, perhaps, but man you flout,
Worst atheist: to have no faith in man
Who, preyed upon by greed throughout his span,
Yet strives to put his selfishness to rout.

Oh golden word in brazen letters, this!
The cattle manger now's each blaring mart.
Our Christmas Star is from the five-and-ten. . . .
Revere no less its every glint of bliss
For Christ is ever born within the heart
When thoughts are lifted up to Man from men.

—Ralph Cheyney.

Love at the World's Door

On the window sill of the world
Let the candle tower tall
In tribute to One who lay
In a Bethlehem cattle stall.

He is out on the crooked road
Where tempests are tops that spin.
He knocks at your door tonight.
Oh, world, will you let Him in?

—Lucia Trent.

Christmas Night

When choir boys chant the Christmas songs
With childish voices muted . . . slow,
The tears spring forth, as "Silent Night"
With poignant notes is caroled low.
Upon Yule trees the candles shine
All through the night they softly glow
Like stars that once the Wise Men saw
Nineteen hundred years ago,
When the shepherds heard the angel THEN
Proclaiming "Peace! . . GOOD WILL TO MEN!"
Yet through travail our souls shall come
In time to silence gun and drum.

—Mary Ward.

Can the Christian Use the Boycott?

HERBERT HIGGINBOTHAM

The merely cynical person will say, "Why not? Christians have used, and are using, every other form of force known to humanity; why should they be choosey about the boycott?" Those who are merely objective, without being cynical, will point out that most Christians never question the ethics of other forms of economic pressure, such as the restrictive tariff, the imports quota, manipulation of exchange rates, etc., freely used by their national governments against the governments and peoples of other lands.

One cannot assume that the average Christian, who is ready to support his country in using war as an instrument of national policy, will get excited about the moral issue involved in a trade boycott of some other state, for that would surely seem like straining at the gnat while swallowing the camel. For whom then does the use of the trade boycott assume the aspect of a moral problem? It seems to narrow down to those who, on religious or humanitarian grounds, have become pacifists. To the person who is a pacifist because he is a Christian, the problem of the trade boycott seems to present a difficult dilemma.

The Christian who has made his own the lofty moral concepts of the Sermon on the Mount is perplexed in his attempt to hold fast his faith in the Jesus way of loving one's enemies, and at the same time to make his influence felt against the ruthless rape of weaker nations being carried on in his world of today by militaristic states like Japan and Italy. John Nevin Sayre put the utilitarian arguments against the trade boycott in an article in the *Christian Century* recently, under three heads: (1) that it would not check, but rather stimulate aggression; (2) that it would react injuriously upon the country using it; (3) that the use of the trade boycott against aggressor nations would intensify economic derangement, since it would usually be applied against the so-called "have-not" nations. Mr. Sayre's argument against the boycott on utilitarian grounds seems defective because he uses the terms "economic sanctions" and "boycott," as though they were one and the same thing, and points to the failure of the attempt to apply economic sanctions against Italy through the League of Nations as one of his main proofs. At the present time it does not appear that the nations of the world are ready to coöperate in applying economic sanctions fully and effectively; in the recent case against Italy they were applied too late, and most of the essential war supplies such as oil, gasoline, basic metals, and cotton, were not seriously involved. On some future occasion, economic sanctions applied by a group of states, especially with the coöperation of the United States, might be much more effective.

There is, however, a fundamental difference between economic sanctions applied officially by governments, acting either singly or in concert, and a trade boycott voluntarily undertaken by individual citizens in their private capacity. Mr. Sayre's article scarcely touched the latter technique.

Tolstoi years ago pointed out that war could be stopped if individual citizens refused to fight. In like manner, the sinews of modern war could be cut off at their source if individual citizens refused to trade. It is this sort of a boycott, as I understand it, that E. Stanley Jones advocates as a Christian technique against aggressor nations. Applied by citizens of the United States and Britain, who take 65 per cent of Japanese export trade, such a boycott might be most effective. We have not yet seen it tried. What we have seen is the reverse of the boycott, namely our citizens rushing in to make all the money they can out of supplying Japan and other aggressor states with the material they need for their conquests.

Those who oppose the boycott idea, including Mr. Sayre, have offered no other plan except complete unconcern and inaction, which, as Stanley Jones strongly affirms, is unsatisfying to the aroused Christian conscience. Moreover, such attitudes, including our much-vaunted neutrality policy, play directly and powerfully into the hands of the militaristic states and cripple the unprepared nations they ravage.

Out of the controversy, it seems to me, there emerge ten good reasons in favor of Christians individually boycotting Japan:

1. Such action taken by individuals, acting according to their own consciences, does not involve our governments.

2. To the extent that such a boycott decreases trade with Japan, the sinews of war for the Japanese militarists are stopped at their source.

3. If innocent people in Japan suffer, that is part of the price the Japanese people must pay for failure to take over control of their own government from the militarists. Christians will regret this, but the remedy is in their hands, not ours. If conditions were reversed, it would be right that we should pay a similar price.

4. The fact that the boycott is a two-edged weapon and would react unfavorably in our own economic condition, if true, saves it from being the weapon of economic self-interest. The true Christian is prepared to make his proportionate sacrifice.

5. The boycott gives promise of being the most effective plan yet devised whereby Christians can actively express their disapproval of aggressive wars.

6. It does not depend upon, nor need provoke, any hate of the guilty nation. On the contrary, it is resorted to with regret and in the hope that reconciliation can be effected as speedily as possible.

7. It is not inconsistent with, but consistent with, the best concepts of Christianity. The *motive* is all-important, and that motive is to restrain the aggressor, defend the right, protect the weak, also with a view to the ultimate benefit of the aggressor.

8. Christians have far too long failed to exercise any influence on national policies, and for them to continue to remain aloof or ineffective in the broad field of human relationships eventually means the failure of Christianity as a way of life.

9. If there is a better course of action for Christians, it is more likely to appear as the result of positive action, than as a consequence of either unconcern or fear to take any action at all.

10. If successful, Christians would for the first time in modern history have demonstrated their solidarity and effectiveness as a force to be reckoned with in international affairs, thus paving the way for further steps toward Christianizing a very unchristian world.

For all these reasons, I believe that Christians, in this time of almost complete negation of human values by nationalistic states, ought to use the trade boycott as individuals, where they believe that by this means wrong might be checked and justice championed. And this applies not only to Japan in 1937, but to all other situations in human relationships, whether foreign or domestic.

New Evangelism

MIRIAM ZIONY

As I think of the present world chaos, of poverty and oppression that grow greater with every move made for liberation, of constantly increasing armaments and aggressions in spite of disarmament conferences and neutrality laws, I wonder at the wisdom of attaining brotherhood and good will by "waging peace" and "fighting war" and by all resistance methods, in the economic and industrial as well as in the international fields.

Never before have men yearned for peace more earnestly than today. Never before has there been a more conscious desire for coöperation and good will, a more sincere groping toward goodness. Yet never have the forces of evil and destruction been so powerful or so capable of overwhelming the good. Of what use are non-aggression pacts and war resisters' pledges when science is being so perfected that a few airplanes can drop enough bombs to kill off an entire city? We strive to outlaw war, and in Europe and the Far East they are outlawing peace.

Yet it cannot be that human beings with love in their hearts for their own kin, men who would risk their lives to save a drowning cat or dog, men who stand aghast and trembling at the sight of blood and disaster, kill for the love of killing!

For twenty years a group of Communist theorists in Russia have been trying to build the perfect society. But today purges, counter-revolutionary plots, and fascist dictatorships with their own forceful methods of installing justice seem to be nearer at hand than the brotherhood of man. Truly those who live by the sword are ever in dread of perishing by the sword—the sword of words as well as the sword of steel.

Not by fighting the capitalists or condemning imperialism can we do away with poverty and oppression. Even if by some magic formula all the wealth of the world could today be evenly distributed, tomorrow some new form of domination would arise just as slavery and feudalism and the divine right of kings have in their turn given way to other evils.

One drop of poison can contaminate a cupful of pure water but a drop of water cannot counteract the effects of a whole cup of poisonous liquid—except through the miracle of a chemical reaction. So, only the miracle of a spiritual reaction can counteract the effects of the poison that threatens to destroy humanity.

If there is ever to be true unity it will have to be a unity and a reconciliation of all mankind, the rich as well as the poor, the oppressor and the oppressed. We would not reproach a man because he is sick with a cancer, nor would we attempt to cure him by first instilling in him a sense of guilt. Why then do we want to cure a cancerous growth of mind and soul by such a method? Must there not be a liberation without condemnation?

I think of that allegory in which the wind and the sun tried their strength at making a traveler on the road take off his coat. The wind blew and blew one icy blast and one fierce gust after another but the man wrapped his coat tighter and tighter about himself. Then the sun came and with his warm rays accomplished that which was impossible through storm and fury. So there is need of much light and warmth before man can be made to cast off his coat of fear and hatred and greed.

Let us go to those who spend their lives in accumulating money and other forms of wealth and power, and show them that, though—like Midas of old—everything they touch turns to gold, their hunger is not to be appeased by gold. By painting a picture of the poverty and wretchedness and injustice existing in the world, let us so stir the souls of those who control the economic and political destiny of the nations that they will use their genius for organization in such ways as to prevent the formation of new intolerances and new injustices while the old ones are being eliminated.

It may be that even the Stalins and the Mussolinis and the Hitlers, the lesser or newer dictators, even the money changers in the temple, can be won to a vision of greater power and greater glory.

Tinsel Wrappings

The Christmas lights are colored moons once more
  And love in silver wrappings waits a time
For giving. Yet the cannons' bark and roar
  Persistently are drowning out the chime
Of throaty bells. How glibly we can talk
  Of angels chorusing of peace to men,
While, dragon-tongued, the hordes of Mammon stalk
  The blind, and sere their hearts with war again!

Turn on your lights, while hungry children crawl
  Like angleworms in burrows under ground.
Repeat your songs, while shell-torn mothers fall
  Where broken homes in shrapnel lie around.
How well this sham of tinsel wrappings fits
The tin-foil hearts of warring hypocrites!

—Eva Willes Wangsgard.

World Government With or Without Geneva

LOLA MAVERICK LLOYD

This is my fourth consecutive year to be in Geneva during the Assembly of the League of Nations in order to observe and especially to press wherever I can for peace and for women's rights.

The international campaign for women's rights progressed this year to the point of an Assembly vote for a committee of experts, four women and five men, to study the legal position of women everywhere. For the League, so undemocratic in its character, the project of a responsible and thorough study of women's status marks an advance. Study will be educative to all concerned, possibly leading to action. But while it is going on, our status may grow worse unless women who know that equality is what we want keep up the constant pressure of a political campaign.

It was the Latin Americans who took the first international steps for women's rights by launching the two equality treaties and by bringing women's status before the League for the first time. When this and other activities of theirs met with rebuff, they began to believe that their membership in the League was only losing them prestige. Several of the South Americans have now resigned, leaving Europe to dominate the League more than ever. Will the Americas as a result form a union of their own, with the United States joining in? Such a tendency is visible. But, now that entanglements are world-wide, regional or even continental unions are not enough. If the Americas would only take the lead toward the real thing at last, a practical federation of the world!

Since the South Americans got somewhat discouraged, our best help in Geneva for the international woman movement has come from the smaller democracies and new states of Europe and Asia, never from Britain nor France nor Holland nor their dominions. The so-called great democracies, indeed! Avoid war-slogans and call them what they are: great democratic empires or great imperialist democracies. They show no tendency whatever to extend their democracy to women. And even of those Geneva delegates to whom the feminists are grateful for help, it must be said that the initiative for progress never comes from them but from great leadership entirely outside the League. How long must we batter at the door of the League of Nations for attention to our just complaints?

In questions directly concerning peace the door of the League is shut even tighter to popular pressure. Or perhaps the peace movement has brought to the top no keen and persistent leadership. The recent record of the League of Nations for peace action finds few apologists, even among its professional devotees. Useless, however, to blame the League because the Covenant fails to make it a real government or empower it to make peace. Not that the world government should *ever* have military power; but it must have a full mandate for its job. Unless the governments give up to it some portion of their sovereignty, how can the League do more than recommend?

If great leaders devoted themselves to its development, the present League of Nations could grow into the world government. We do not find them on the job in Geneva; nor do we find any strong pressure from the people for League reform —except in 1936 during the Ethiopian massacre, now forgotten or politely ignored. During that short spasm, revision of the Covenant seemed imminent. But this year, with at least two other wars going on, revision is hardly mentioned in Geneva.

The Committee of Twenty Eight for the application of the principles of the Covenant still exists, and something may occur to put life into it. The democracies in complete control of the League may become courageous enough for action. Our country may send persons of vision to be unofficial members. Russia may remove its veto on revision of any kind. Peace societies may awaken people to their desperate need of immediate world organization. Miracles do happen. But when the trend in League rulings and lack of rulings continues steadily in the opposite direction from democracy, how long can we afford to watch and wait? When do we start to build anew?

My own peace league had its triennial congress this summer, and there I advocated a call for governmental action toward a World Constitutional Convention, and that we, the pacifists, draw up our own draft of an ideal constitution for world government. My resolution was rejected as not closely concerned with any emergency. Yet to me the beginning of a world government seems the most pressing emergency of all, the only escape for the human race from a ghastly interval of history.

There is a depressing theory that the present is the ultimate measure of man's brain, and extinction in insanity his doom, but healthy minds cannot subscribe to it. Who shall limit the mind? Despair over the state of the world gets us nowhere. Better to test our inborn faith in the power of reason by trying to bring order *in our time* out of our international life. Everything except politics has become international already: religion, science, art, business, education, and all the movements for reform. Political unity is long overdue. Why not be hopeful about it!

An eventual world government would seem to be inevitable. The crucial question is: can we succeed quickly enough in organizing it so that our children and grandchildren can be spared long years of needless warfare and degradation? Then we have to build a new order now, while the old is tumbling to ruin about us—and not by small hesitating steps. We might prefer to attempt a solution of one puzzling problem after another. But such partial solutions—of disarmament, economic problems, finance—all of them are impossible precisely because they are partial. International questions are bound up together and have to be solved together. The whole chaos must be tackled at once and organized into a system with a government at the top.

Here is a job for our submerged American idealism, potentially so strong! What has happened to it since the world war? Has our international spirit been dampened by the devoted followers of Woodrow Wilson who still want us to love the League of Nations just as he left it and repel sug-

gestions of wholesome revision? Without doubt the League of Nations is now so unpopular in the United States, justly or unjustly, that nobody running for office dares to let the voters know he favors our entry. Very few do favor it, even privately. Meanwhile, without us in it, the League is fated to lose prestige and authority. As it goes on losing, Americans condemn it ever more bitterly. How to break the vicious circle? The answer is: only by beginning in America something new and better than the League. Learning useful lessons from its failures, we can build a real world government representative of peoples, not merely governments—no pan-American affair, but all-inclusive and minus every attribute of military power, a right-about-face from the old hateful war system.

The vision of a federation of nations has inspired men and women for centuries. Our generation can make the dream come true. Now it is practical. World union is indispensable and anything else is impractical. Science, which has brought the nations closer and closer, will help us ease the unendurable friction that has naturally resulted, for it is the wonderful progress of modern science that makes world-organization at last practicable. When we fly over oceans and mountain ranges and converse across the hemispheres, the world is already a unit and already civilized enough to be able to use reason instead of violence in curing our sick political life. We are all neighbors, whether we will or no. Let us then be good neighbors and make a living community of our scandalous chaos.

This sounds like disloyal talk, but it is not meant to be hostile to Geneva. A rising determination in America to start a democratic world government may be the very spur needed for the regeneration of the League of Nations. But with or without the League, this planet must have its super-government.

Study Table

The Meaning of Death

THOUGHTS ON LIFE AND DEATH. *By William Ernest Hocking. 255 pp. New York: Harper and Brothers. An expansion of the Ingersoll Lecture on Immortality (Harvard, 1936) and of the Hiram W. Thomas Lecture on "The Meanings of Life" (University of Chicago, 1936). $2.00.*

Interest in the meaning of death has so much declined in the mind of the average modern that one is inclined to see something characteristic of modernity in Dr. Johnson's observation that "the whole of life is but keeping away the thought of it." Professor Hocking speaks as a modern, then, when he approaches his subject "not to prove immortality nor to disprove it." Yet, he deprecates the indifference of modernity toward the meaning of death by stating that it is his purpose "to shake ourselves out of sophistication about it, to disturb customary attitudes."

In the prologue to the Ingersoll Lecture, Professor Hocking recognizes that the attitude of men toward immortality is not an accident; it is rather an index to their whole philosophy of life. Yet, the question of survival is one "in which many people have lost their interest because they have taken their answer, Yes or No, with their general world-view. It is settled in the affirmative or (more frequently today) in the negative by what they otherwise believe." At all events, it seldom receives its full meed of critical attention. It has "no place in the business of science." In philosophy, "it is a last chapter, an appendix, a footnote to other matters." And even many of the churches virtually deny the importance of the theme, for it is "now largely evaded or mummed" by them, "or poetized out of literal sense." Nevertheless, Professor Hocking feels that there remains a widespread "incredulity toward death" as final, in the mind of the common man. And he makes it plain that if he would not prove immortality he would at least encourage this incredulity by deflating the "dogmatic, seeming-scientific negations" of certain of the naturalists and humanists. Accordingly, he denies that doubt in the face of complete negation is due to wishful thinking. At least, it is not wholly so. The incredulity derives rather from the general suspicion with which all obvious judgments about human destiny come to be regarded. To the common man, the philosopher who is exclusively preoccupied with the plain and primary facts presented in sensation and perception seems to be the credulous person. Moreover, even when belief in survival does result from wishful thinking, "it is not so much a wish for self as for some one else," it is the registering of a claim of right, of affection. On the other hand, the humanist's denial of survival and his claim of preference for quality of living rather than for longevity, Professor Hocking concedes, has a philosophical rootage. Aye, there's the rub: for there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in their "habitual monism."

The gravamen of his charge against the naturalists and the humanists appears when he maintains that their monism is seriously defective in its interpretation of the human self. This defect constricts their thinking on life as well as on death. Certain of the psychologists, he reminds us, have under the alleged authority of empiricism virtually deprived man not only of selfhood but also of consciousness. He believes, however, that a truer empiricism is now in the making. Indeed, the "confused and fumbling" theory of the subconscious as now envisaged by the psychoanalysts reveals the way in which the neglect of certain empirical elements of self-consciousness is being revenged, for the "various alleged contents and functions of the subconscious are for the most part fragments" of a more inclusive self than an earlier, narrow empiricism deigned to recognize.

The chief obstruction to the emergence of a sounder empiricism, he maintains, is the failure to recognize a basic "dilemma of world structure." Psychology, bent on achieving status as a natural science, insists upon dealing with only that aspect of the self which is an object *within* nature. This type of "physicalism" can readily provide for everything except mind. But the

psychologist must also deal with another world of discourse, with the phenomena and language relating to the subjective fabric of the mind, with "experience," with sense data. This world of discourse can provide for everything except a real physical world. Thus, according to the one language, matter or energy is the standard of reality; and, according to the other man's, thoughts and feelings are the standard.

Professor Hocking would resolve this dilemma by recognizing that both views of reality are true and by employing "a principle of empirical duality" which refers these two worlds of discourse to a duality within human nature itself. The application of this principle constitutes the dominant theme of the Ingersoll Lecture. In accordance with this principle, he argues that we must recognize two selves in man, the one a reflective self, the other an excursive, dated self. The reflective self functions in receiving, recognizing, evaluating every new experience. It contains not only the stored-up memories and unsatisfied wishes of the subconscious, as described by the psychoanalysts, but also the unexploited powers of the creative self; it is in time and yet it transcends time through its capacity for surveying it, it hovers over experience at the center of selfhood. The excursive self, on the other hand, represents the outgoing attempts of the creative, reflective self to realize its possibilities within a given space and time. Thus the creative self is infinite in possibilities, at least infinitude of possibility is its essence; the dated self is finite, for it must through decision take irrevocable shape in space and time. The latter is the judged and created aspect of the self, the former is the remembering judge as well as the creator and re-creator. The author recognizes that these contrasts are imperfectly outlined. But the neglect of them by the psychologists, he urges, is an illustration of the narrowness of much self-styled empiricism. Particularly needful is a study of the reflective self and the excursive self with reference to the experience of time. Indeed, he feels that "our empirical psychology lags behind contemporary physics in recognizing the inner complexity of our consciousness of time."

Now, since human personality, as known empirically, requires both of these aspects of selfhood, Professor Hocking deduces that it would be illogical to suppose that the reflective self (which by its vision is indeed capable of transcending time) continues on in a state of incorporeality after the death of the body and the dated self. Such a supposition is the error of Platonism. The principle of empirical duality is equally valid for this life and the next. Hence, it would seem that, if forced to choose between them, Professor Hocking would incline more to the Hebrew conception of the resurrection of the body than to the Platonic conception of (an interim state of) disembodied spirit. Into his discussion of psycho-physiology and mathematical analogies we cannot enter here. His suggestion is that the existence of other space-time milieus than the one familiar to us may be envisaged at least as a possibility, that the excursive dated self may die with the body and that then the reflective self may conceivably proceed to work in a new medium of expression in another space-time milieu. In this way the reflective self may continue the process of creating the more perfect personality which is its destiny.

Obviously, this is a highly speculative answer to the question of survival and one which in turn raises almost as many questions as "habitual monism" does. Nevertheless, it serves the good purpose of reminding us that the basic issues in the psychology of the self can be properly dealt with only after some effectual resolution of the "dilemma of world structure" has been made. The author would admit that his general conception of immortality relies upon an intuition of "objective fact in the structure of things" and upon an intuition of what "ought to be," and that it looks for corroboration to the intimations of immortality which are so persistently cherished by the racial sense of mankind. Yet, he would urge (and this is in some measure the burden of the second part of the book) that it grows also out of a comprehensive view of the nature and meaning of life as we know it. It should, therefore, appeal to the realist as well as to the mystic.

For life has a meaning as well as meanings. These meanings of life are discussed under the captions, "the worth of merely being alive," "worth in doing and in things done," "worth in love and appreciation," and "worth in serving causes." But these meanings are transcended by and gathered up into a total meaning, "the worth of fulfilling a destiny." In discussing this totality of meaning, the author again directs some shafts at the humanists. Especially does he stress the view that, contrary to the assertions of the humanists, Christianity through its emphasis on "other-worldliness," notwithstanding its defects, has contributed something of incalculable worth to the modern world by developing that spirit of detachment which not only demands and inspires far-vistaed totalities of meaning but which also constitutes an indispensable element in the modern scientific temper. Of equal interest is his criticism that the pragmatists have over-emphasized the activistic aspect of the self to the neglect of the self as a center of potentiality and creativity. This criticism culminates in the assertion that John Dewey in his book, *A Common Faith,* has turned upon his earlier view that ideas mean what they lead to and now recognizes that "particular experiences are also instrumental of ideas." As against Dewey's theory of the rôle of the imagination in the good life, the author also argues that if human life is to rest seriously on the connection with the environing world, the instrumentalists must pass beyond "imagination to the objective facts of that relationship." And if carried far enough, such a process must in order to satisfy the demand for objectivity envisage a total meaning which interprets both life and the world, and even death.

Clearly this book expands views which Professor Hocking has set forth in his previous writings, but in so doing it raises major issues that have, as he says, in some quarters been "mummed" or "poetized." Certainly it will accomplish its avowed purpose for many a reader by shaking him out of sophistication and by disturbing his customary attitudes. It should be added that, since the book is written with Professor Hocking's characteristic lucidity and charm of style, it will appeal to everyman as well as to the more academic reader. But besides this, the book marks out a sector of philosophical discussion which, in the dialectic of history, is destined sooner or later to provide more inclusive and penetrating statements of the problems than are now prevalent. For this as well as for other reasons, it is a matter of import (and of pride for Americans) that Professor Hocking has recently been invited to deliver both the Gifford and the Hibbert Lectures in Great Britain.

JAMES LUTHER ADAMS.

(*Continued on page* 132)

Study Table

(*Continued from page* 131)

Henry Ford

THE FLIVVER KING. *By Upton Sinclair. Published by the Author, Station A, Pasadena, California. 25 cents.*

This paper-covered volume interests us from two points of view. First, as another work from the indefatigable pen of Upton Sinclair! In this book he attempts to do for the automobile workers in the factories of Henry Ford what he attempted in *No Passeran* to do for the Loyalists on the battlefield of Spain. *No Passeran* did not seem to us to be successful, although it was widely and enthusiastically read in Spain and other European countries. Sinclair in that book was out of his field—dealing with material which was not his own. But *The Flivver King* is triumphantly done, and just for the reason that it is material appointed for his hand. Here is the author of *The Jungle* at work again! The meat-packers of Chicago are now succeeded by the automobile manufacturer of Chicago. This latest book is no such well-rounded, titanic story as *The Jungle*. It is more a pamphlet than a novel. But within its own bounds and in its own way, it is superb.

The Flivver King is in essence a re-telling of the story of Henry Ford. It begins with Ford's earliest experimentations with the "horseless carriage," and ends with the present hour of impending struggle for the organization of Ford's workers. Sinclair has used again much of the now familiar material of this tale—and incidently shows a quite amazing knowledge of the technical and financial history of automobile production! But he builds his facts vigorously into a structure of interpretation, which serves to make the narrative of Ford's miraculous rise something "new and strange." What a billion dollars has done to Ford in transforming the character of his manhood is the real theme—a man originally kind as well as shrewd, human in certain basic simplicities of life, slowly but surely changed into the hard, cold, unintended but none the less ruthless cruelty of sheer power. Sinclair never berates his victim, never denounces or condemns him. His whole approach to the personal problem involved is sympathetic, even at times tender. But the picture of what money does to men is none the less terrible as here presented.

Set over against Henry Ford as chief protagonist of the tale, is Abner Shutt, a worker in the Ford factory. Abner was a neighbor's little boy in Detroit when Henry was making his first experiments. He helped to push along the first automobile when it went sputtering uncertainly down the road. He got a job in the first little shop, and labored steadily through all the years of miraculous expansion of the Ford plant. Abner and his family present the obverse side of the billion dollars—what money does to those who make it, but do not receive or enjoy it, under modern methods of industrial exploitation. The story moves back and forth between Henry and Abner, employer and employe, like a shuttle weaving the pattern of narrative. At the end it drives into a design of horror which is one of the most terrific things that Upton Sinclair ever wrote. Here is the full tragedy of capital and labor set forth in contrasting scenes which are unforgettable.

But we said this book interests us for two reasons! The second is that it has been taken over by the Automobile Workers of America, at their Detroit headquarters, and distributed to the tune of two hundred thousand copies. This impresses us as a more effective, not to say more proper, method of procedure in a labor crisis than all the sit-down strikes and mass-picketing procedures of recent months. Here is imagination in pursuit of victory! What labor must have in this country is the support of public opinion in its struggles. This public opinion is alienated by rough-tough tactics, but may be triumphantly won by such an appeal as Sinclair has presented in this exciting novel. We all know what *The Jungle* did when its pages, more devastating than the bullets of a machine-gun, were aimed at the meat-packers. The same thing will be done to Henry Ford by this literary bombardment. If Waterloo was won on the playgrounds of Eton, so it may come to be said that the battle for the unionization of the Ford factories was won in the pages of *The Flivver King*.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

A Handbook of War

WHAT EVERY YOUNG MAN SHOULD KNOW ABOUT WAR. *By Harold Roland Shapiro. New York: Knight Publishers. $1.50.*

Here is information about war, if you want to read it, if you dare to face it. Not the romance and glitter, not the flags and the music and the triumphs, but the actual facts of what happens to a man when he marches away to battle, and of what happens to him on the battlefield, in the hospital, and in the morgue. They're terrible but true, and every one should know them.

Mr. Shapiro, a New York lawyer, had a clever idea. It was to ask all the questions that any sensitive, or even curious, person might ask about the details of military service, fighting, wounds, disease, and death, and seek answers in the official reports and personal testimony of the medical corps in the various belligerent armies in the late war. So he went to work and gathered a great mass of first hand information, and then arranged it in familiar question-and-answer form. The result is a catechism on such questions as enlistment, mental reactions, life in the trenches, poison gas, wounds and weapons, over the top to the hospital, sex in war-time, malingering, and "when I die." The author has intruded no comments or interpretations, least of all any color, of his own. He has simply piled up quotations, each one checked and verified, and hurled them at the reader like a barrage-fire. The effect is to stop the breath and curdle the blood.

I wish I had space to produce in these columns some of Mr. Shapiro's questions and answers. Only the actual data can produce any adequate realization of what war really is from the standpoint of the officers, physicians, and nurses who deal with its victims. But it is best, perhaps, that I should refer UNITY's readers to the book itself. Especially should young men read it, as the author's title suggests, that they may know what awaits them in the next war.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.